

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

300854Z Jun 06

UNCLAS PARIS 004511

SIPDIS

FROM USMISSION TO UNESCO PARIS

STATE FOR IO/UNESCO CRISTINA NOVO
STATE FOR OES SHIRA YOFFE
STATE FOR IO/S LISA SPRATT
STATE FOR DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR DAS HOFFMAN
STATE FOR DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR NPS STEPHEN MORRIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [AORC](#) [SCUL](#) [KSCA](#) [SENV](#) [UNESCO](#)

SUBJECT: UNESCO: STRIVING FOR RESULTS BASED MANAGEMENT AT THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE - REFLECTION FIRST

1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY: On May 30, 2006, consultant Bruno Lefevre gave a presentation about his work to institute Results Based Management (RBM) at the World Heritage (WH) Center. He was one of two consultants hired to examine the RBM framework and World Heritage System model, and propose a roadmap toward RBM; the project is funded by the UN Foundation, an American NGO. The purpose of the meeting was for Lefevre - who retired from UNESCO in 2005 -- to get feedback and opinions on this presentation from interested delegations before his formal presentation to the entire WH Committee at its July 2006 meeting in Vilnius. Participants noted the abstract quality of Lefevre's work so far, and the fact that not much progress has been made in presenting recommendations. In a side discussion, the Lithuanian Ambassador, President of the World Heritage Committee, said she did not expect the DG to raise the issue of WH Center autonomy at Vilnius, though she reported that talks are ongoing. The delegations present at the briefing were: the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Lithuania, Japan and St. Lucia. END SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION.

ON WH REFORM, "PROCESSES," NO RECOMMENDATIONS YET

2. Lefevre's presentation did not evoke specific reforms. Instead, the consultants have identified the "processes" of what Lefevre termed the "World Heritage System" including the Committee, the Centre, and the Advisory Bodies. In this schema, the consultants identified core, management, and support processes. Within each "process", the consultants identified outputs, output indicators, outcomes and outcome indicators. After detailing these processes, the consultants proposed four steps to implementing RBM: 1. Define an overall WH Center strategic plan. 2. Re-organize the WH Center around processes. 3. Set up measurement system. 4. Restructure WH Committee governance. In response to questions, Lefevre said he would present specific recommendations at the 2008 WH Committee meeting.

3. Many at the briefing thought the presentation would be too technical to gain broad support and enthusiasm among the participants at the Vilnius meeting. Both Lithuania and the UK suggested there be less jargon in the presentation in order to make it more accessible. The UK reminded the consultant that many of those at the meeting would not be experts in, or even necessarily aware of, RBM. Japan agreed with Lithuania and the UK, saying that the presentation would be improved by stating up front what the objectives were.

4. Others, including Belgium, expressed surprise and disappointment that the consultants had so far only identified "processes," but had not finalized concrete recommendations. The UK said that the consultant should make clear in the presentation that further recommendations would be forthcoming.

5. Note: The week following the briefing, the UK and St. Lucia (former chair of the WH Committee) expressed concern to the U.S. Delegation that Lefevre's work was not founded on a thorough audit or evaluation of the World Heritage Committee. The UK posited that Lefevre might not be sufficiently independent in his approach - ie unwilling to make strong recommendations -- given his previous career at the UNESCO secretariat. (Bruno Lefevre retired in December 2005. He was responsible for RBM training at the Bureau of Strategic Planning. He had previously served as Director of UNESCO Offices in Ghana and in Cambodia.)
End Note.

WILL WH CENTER AUTONOMY BE ON THE VILNIUS AGENDA?

6. Finally, concern was raised, particularly by Canada, that the model of the WH Center used by the consultants was already outdated. She questioned whether the WH Center was in fact spending 100 percent of its resources on World Heritage matters. Because of the reform of the Cultural Sector, encouraged by the DG and the new ADG for Culture, there was concern among some in the room that the WH Center staff would be spending less time on World Heritage issues, as it spends more time on other cultural issues.

17. There was also the question of whether or not issues relating to the "autonomous" status of the WH Center would be raised at the Conference in Vilnius. Lithuania, who holds the WH committee presidency this year, is meeting with the Director General the week of June 12; she said would raise this question with him, but confided that she was fairly sure the topic would not be raised in Vilnius.

OLIVER